



# PROCEEDINGS

## 1980 National Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium

### Volume II

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service  
Northeastern Forest Experiment Station  
370 Reed Road, Broomall, PA 19008

Sponsored by:

Northeast Agricultural  
Experiment Stations, NE-100

USDA Forest Service

USDI Heritage Conservation  
and Recreation Service

Recreation Working Group,  
Society of American Foresters

University of New Hampshire,  
Recreation and Parks Program

In cooperation with:

Clemson University

Journal of Leisure Research

Purdue University

USDA, Forest Service    General Technical Report NE-57

## FOREWORD

Volume II of these proceedings contains a wide selection of papers presented at the 1980 Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium. It includes, in addition to papers not available for Volume I, those papers presented during the keynote session, concurrent sessions, evening sessions, and the closing session. Concurrent session papers are clustered around four topics: Trend Measurement Methodologies; Trend Data for Recreation Planning; Industry Sources of Trend Data; and Applied Trend Research.

The closing-session papers provide considerable food for thought about future directions in outdoor recreation trend research. These two papers provide a balance between the need for trend measurement for professional purposes and in the limitations of trend measurement as a means for monitoring social change.

Throughout these proceedings it has been our purpose to promote, provoke, stimulate and, we hope, encourage the establishment of new and better data systems to monitor activity effectively in all sectors of outdoor recreation. We took this approach knowing there are certain inherent risks; not having an abundance of reliable trend indicators is often a politically expedient way of conducting the public's business in outdoor recreation. During an evening session in the

course of the symposium, a small group of participants chose to speculate on just what some of the risks might be if we were suddenly faced with a world where all of the necessary trend measurement systems were in place. The consensus was that a number of undesirable reactions could be readily predicted: rejection--or challenging the data because of inconsistencies and a lack of representivity; procrastination--a paralysis of programs while decision makers await the latest in a series of data; prostitution--the use of data to justify more public programs rather than use it for better planning; sanctification--the establishment and growth of specialized elite decision makers to monitor an increasing array of potentially relevant phenomena; and routinization--the complete reliance on data resulting in the disappearance of a risk-taking attitude on the part of those who are paid to make difficult decisions.

The positive aspects, we firmly believe, of better data, better planning, and better decisions easily outweigh all of these risks. But the risks are there, and as we move inevitably in the direction of greater government accountability, we need to be constantly alert to their emergence.

WILBUR F. LaPAGE, Chairman  
Program Committee

THE 1980 NATIONAL  
OUTDOOR RECREATION TRENDS SYMPOSIUM

Held at the New England Center for Continuing Education  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, New Hampshire  
April 20-23, 1980

SPONSORED BY

Northeast Agricultural Experiment Stations, Project NE-100  
USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station  
USDI, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service  
Society of American Foresters, Recreation Working Group  
University of New Hampshire, Recreation and Parks Program

PROGRAM COMMITTEE --

Wilbur F. LaPage  
Malcolm I. Bevins  
Robert D. Greenleaf  
Floyd L. Newby  
Gerald L. Cole  
A. Robert Koch  
Herbert E. Echelberger  
Douglas M. Knudson

CONCURRENT SESSIONS --

Floyd L. Newby  
Herbert E. Echelberger  
Douglas M. Knudson  
Kenneth J. Hock  
Marvin W. Kottke  
Mahmood Seyala

ADVISORS --

R. Duane Lloyd  
Earl Patric  
Basil J. F. Mott  
Roland Robinson  
Meg Maguire  
Robert McLellan  
Barry Tindall  
Hugo John  
Fred Knight

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS --

Robert D. Greenleaf  
Herbert E. Echelberger  
Gus C. Zaso  
Lawrence A. Rondeau  
Patricia C. Merrill

COOPERATORS

Clemson University, Department of Recreation and Park Administration  
Journal of Leisure Research, NRPA  
Purdue University, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources

CONTENTS

KEYNOTE SESSION

New Hampshire--an outdoor recreation trend trend leader  
 George T. Hamilton ..... 1

Recreation trends: Indicators of environmental quality  
 Roy Feuchter ..... 7

Converging social trends--emerging outdoor recreation issues  
 Carl H. Reidel ..... 9

The dynamics of recreation participation: ski touring in Minnesota  
 Timothy B. Knopp, G. Ballman, and L. C. Merriam ..... 69

Trends in the temporal distribution of park use  
 Robert E. Manning and Paula L. Cormier ..... 81

Network analysis: a new tool for resource managers  
 Ruth H. Allen ..... 89

TRENDS IN POLICY AND INFLUENCE

Trends in outdoor recreation legislation  
 George H. Siehl ..... 15

Trends in organizational memberships and lobbying  
 William R. Burch (Vol. 1)

Land management policy and program trends  
 Darrell E. Lewis ..... 19

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recreation resource management challenges  
 Gerald T. Purvis ..... 21

TREND DATA FOR RECREATION PLANNING

Outdoor recreation trend research: making the possible probable  
 Geoffrey Godbey ..... 99

Trends in federal land acquisition, protection strategies, and planning  
 Warren Brown ..... 103

Social-psychological implications for recreation resource planning  
 Hardeep S. Bhullar, Alan R. Everson, and Scout L. Gunn ..... 109

Automatic, time-interval traffic counts for recreation area management planning  
 D. L. Erickson, C. J. Liu, and H. K. Cordell ..... 115

TREND MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGIES

A methodology for the systematic collection, storage, and retrieval of trend data for the U.S. Army Engineers recreation program  
 Dennis B. Propst and Robert V. Abbey.. 25

Forecasting trends in outdoor recreation activities on a multi-state basis  
 Vincent A. Scardino, Josef Schwalbe, and Marianne Beauregard ..... 35

A simulation model for forecasting downhill ski participation  
 Daniel J. Stynes and Daniel M. Spotts ..... 55

Cross-country skiing trend data: planning for participant needs  
 Floyd L. Newby and William D. Lilley ..... 125

A possible railroad-oriented scenario in Potomac River Basin planning  
 George H. Siehl ..... 135

APPLIED TREND RESEARCH

Changes in recreation-oriented travel in the northeast between 1972 and 1977  
 Gerald L. Cole ..... 139

Trends in Allagash wilderness waterway uses  
in the 1970's

Thomas J. Cieslinski ..... 147

Assessing changes in the importance  
of tourism in the northeast

Tommy L. Brown ..... 151

A method for explaining trends in river  
recreation demand

George L. Peterson, David W.  
Lime, and Dorothy R. Anderson ..... 161

Trends in recreational vehicle traffic  
in northeastern Minnesota

Arthur Norton, Karen Noyce, and  
Thomas J. Wood ..... 171

INDUSTRY SOURCES OF TREND DATA

Snowmobiling in the 1980's: continued  
progress for a mature recreational  
activity

William T. Jobe, Jr. .... 177

Woodall Publishing Company, an important  
industry source of camping information

Curtis Fuller, Paul Foght, and Linda  
Profalizer ..... 181

Industry sources of trend data--skiing

William F. Malcolm, Jr. .... 193

Trends in participation sports during the  
decade of the 70's

Robert J. Halstenrud ..... 195

RECREATION TRENDS--A FUTURE LOOK

Recreation trends--a future look "So  
what?--implications for the  
recreation profession"

Roger A. Lancaster ..... 203

Outdoor recreation trends in the 1980's  
"So what?--implications for society"

Carlton S. Van Doren ..... 207

REGISTRANTS ..... 215

well-designed facilities and equipment. They will be well informed about their sport or activity, and prepared to support agencies or companies with whom they agree through effective special interest political organizations.

Whether or not you agree with this brief scenario for tomorrow; whether you like it or not, I hope I have provoked you to think about some better alternatives. If this symposium is to be more than a recitation of data about trends, and more than an exercise in projecting the past on a straight line into the future, you will have to employ your creative abilities to the limit. The future is not waiting out there to be discovered. It doesn't yet exist. It will be no better than we can imagine; no better than we are determined to make it. Trends may enlighten our understanding of the alternatives, but they will be destiny only if we insist.

## TRENDS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION LEGISLATION<sup>1</sup>

George H. Siehl<sup>2</sup>

---

The two decades which have passed since the era of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) have been active and fruitful in terms of Federal recreation legislation. The Commission and its final report "Outdoor Recreation for America" strongly influenced the burst of recreation legislation in the 1960's. Even today, the studies prepared under the guidance of the Commission continue to provide useful baseline data. This paper addresses three areas of trends in outdoor recreation legislation-- trends in context, content, and consequences.

---

### TRENDS IN CONTEXT

This is the simplest of the trend areas. It is based upon the realization that recreation is not one of those fields--such as national defense or education--that is considered as an entity by the Congress. Rather it is treated as one member of a family of issues. In the case of recreation, it entered the decade of the 60's as part of the bundle of issues called conservation, a context which consisted in large part of a philosophy toward the uses of natural resources. That philosophy embraced the concept of "balance" between consumption and protection of resources.

For a time after the completion of the ORRRC, the level of legislative activity was high enough to make it seem as if recreation might be important enough to stand alone.

During the mid to late 60's, however, the idea of conservation was being transformed into the broader concept of environmentalism. One catalyst to this transformation, I believe, was the "natural beauty" campaign of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. Her efforts (and the support of President Johnson didn't hurt) brought a wide degree of public awareness that amenities such as parks and recreation areas are important components in determining the quality of life. Further, the public came to recognize the interrelatedness of various activities and the tradeoffs which take place among economics, environment and, a little later, energy.

---

<sup>1</sup>Paper presented at the National Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium, Durham, NH, April 20-23, 1980.

<sup>2</sup>Analyst in Environmental Policy, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.

Thus, through the late 60's and midway into the 70's, recreation considerations were tied to the concept of the environment. Environmentalism differs from conservation rather significantly, however. The environmental movement in seeking to check pollution and other types of degradation has adopted a highly protective stance. For recreation matters, this frequently results in support of preservation efforts and seldom in support of more intensive or development-oriented forms of recreation.

The preservation movement has secured legislation protecting areas which future generations may enjoy. A high price may be paid for these successes, if, as seems to be likely, the broader recreation community has been divided into new preservation and old conservation camps, each of which goes its own way or enters into new contextual relationships.

Where could the user recreationists--as opposed to the preserver recreationists--find their new context? The answer seems to be the economy. The formation of a 243 member Recreation and Tourism Caucus in the House of Representatives; the concerted action of the Congress to prevent weekend gas station closings as part of the President's proposed standby energy conservation program; and the strong reaction to the Energy Department's proposed regulation which could prohibit weekend operation of powerboats in times of energy shortage seems to indicate that Congressional support is there for use-oriented recreationists. The reason is that recreation and tourism are of widespread, major economic importance. As the state of the economy worsens, Congress will possibly become even more protective of viable recreation enterprises.

At the same time, preservation efforts may not be as successful as in recent years, particularly when the choice is to create a new

Wilderness area or allow the recovery of an energy resource or a strategic mineral resource. The context for preservation decisions could shift from environmental protection to the completely different arena of national security. Perhaps with the MX missile siting proposal and the controversy over the cobalt deposits in the proposed West Panther Creek wilderness area, the shift is already underway.

#### TRENDS IN CONTENT

In the past 20 years there have been hundreds of recreation laws passed, thousands of bills introduced, and billions of dollars authorized and appropriated. What were the details of all that legislation?

Instead of reviewing all that's happened, let's look at the trends in five content categories--although that does not exhaust all the possibilities. The five are:

1. Authorization of Federal park and recreation areas;
2. Authorization, planning and management of Federal resource agencies;
3. Assistance to non-Federal agencies;
4. Financing Federal recreation areas; and
5. Related environmental legislation.

In the first category--authorization of Federal park and recreation areas--there are several noticeable trends. Foremost is the trend which saw the number of units increase sharply. The National Park Service, for instance, numbered 209 units in 1960, 281 in 1970, and today 320; including the Executive withdrawals in Alaska. Acreage figures have increased correspondingly. A second, closely-related trend is that toward the acquisition of private lands for addition to the public recreation estate. The authorization of Cape Cod National Seashore in 1961 marked the first time that Congress went to the Federal treasury to buy all the lands for a Federal recreation unit. Earlier Eastern additions to the Park System, such as Shenandoah National Park, Virginia, and Acadia National Park, Maine, were acquired through private, state, and local funding efforts, then donated to the Federal government. Buying land for parks was much more expensive than setting the acreage aside from other Federal holdings; hence a third trend in recreation legislation, acceptance of increased costs.

A fourth trend in the authorizations of new Federal recreation areas has been the creation of specialized areas as wilderness,

wild and scenic rivers, and national trails. The establishment of national seashores and national lakeshores is further indication of the trend toward recognizing the attractiveness of certain natural features to outdoor recreationists. The creation of designated National Recreation Areas to be managed for intensive recreational use shows Congress has been aware of a broad public demand for recreation opportunities.

The second trend category, dealing with the structure and administration of those Federal agencies with recreational responsibilities, would include as its highlight the 1963 Congressional authorization which led to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) in the Department of the Interior. Other pertinent legislation includes the 1960 Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act, the Resources Planning Act of 1974, and its 1976 amendment, these relating to forested lands and especially the Forest Service, and the more recent organic act for the Bureau of Land Management, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. These enactments were not principally directed toward recreation, but they do help to ensure that recreation is one of the purposes for which Federal lands will be managed.

Assistance to non-Federal recreation agencies, the third trend category, is headed by enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This mechanism has provided over 2.5 billion dollars to the States since 1965 to assist in the planning, acquisition and development of outdoor recreation facilities. Federal recreation legislation has also provided for the donation of surplus Federal real property to other units of government for recreational use. Further, Federal agencies may give technical assistance in recreational matters to non-Federal resource agencies. This was one of the provisions of the 1963 Act which led to creation of the BOR. The level of funding support to the States has increased over the years since 1965, clear evidence the Congress has seen the need for a partnership approach to meeting outdoor recreation needs. Although there have been occasional disruptions in this support program (the most serious of which is now threatened in the President's revised budget request), the trendline has been clearly upward.

Much of what was said about the assistance provided to State and local government applies to the fourth trend category--financing Federal recreation areas and activities. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been helpful in securing the passage of authorizing legislation for new recreation areas because Members did not have to vote at the same time to appropriate more money. The funding for the unit would come from the LWCF. The need to vote to put more money into the Fund was largely done away with by tapping the mineral leasing revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf in the 1968 amendments to the LWCF Act. It was through this mechanism that the Fund grew from \$120 million in 1966 to its current authorized

level of \$1 billion.

The authorized funding level provides slight solace to recreationists at this time. President Carter requested less than full funding (\$580 million) in his first budget request for FY 81. The Congress reduced that figure in Committee action to \$290 million. Then the revised Carter budget lowered the request to \$233 million. Some are reminded of the pre-LWCF days when some Members would vote for establishment of a park unit and later vote against the appropriation of funds for acquisition.

To summarize the trend in financing, one might say that it is up, but not certain.

The final category of legislative trend is that of environmental laws which provide direct or indirect support to outdoor recreation. Clean water bills have resulted in thousand of miles of cleaner streams and rivers and thus restored an important recreation resource. Thus, water bodies once again may support recreation fishing and boating and water contact sports. Further progress in this regard is to be expected. The 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act stipulate that certain park and wilderness areas are to be protected from significant deterioration of their air quality.

#### TRENDS IN CONSEQUENCES

Passing a law is something like passing a message because after transmission, the outcome sometimes varies from the intent. These inadvertencies of legislative action may produce trends with broad, but delayed consequences.

One such trend is bringing the Park Service back to town. During the decade of the 1970's Congress enacted legislation to establish sizeable units of the National Park Service in New York (Gateway National Recreation Area), San Francisco (Golden Gate National Recreation Area), Cleveland-Akron (Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area), Atlanta (Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area), Lowell (Lowell National Historical Park), and Los Angeles (Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area). Many applaud this movement of parks to the people. However, these urban areas tend to be expensive to acquire and to operate because they are rather manpower intensive.

In an era of unlimited Federal resources a program of helping to meet urban recreation and open space needs when local government cannot do so may help to achieve a balance in recreational opportunities. When the Federal resources become limited, as now, what will be the consequences? If the available financial and manpower resources are concentrated on the expensive urban areas, what happens to the

traditional Park System units? We may be about to find out.

Another trend in consequences, which was touched upon in the discussion of trends in context, is that in legislation for recreation preservation the opportunities for recreation provision are being reduced. This is perhaps best exemplified at the largest scale by noting that the creation of new wilderness areas has eliminated some possibilities for developing new alpine skiing areas. A mechanism which emphasizes one recreational use without providing for similar consideration of others inadvertently reduces the likelihood of examining alternative uses. Enactment of something like a Developed Recreational Facilities Siting Act might balance the effectiveness of the Wilderness Act and so provide even greater recreational opportunities.

#### UNTOUCHED TRENDS IN RECREATION LEGISLATION

The coverage of this paper has omitted more legislation than it has included. It has, however, identified some of the more important trends which might be discovered in a lengthier review. There are other trends which might be examined in some future forum. Two which come immediately to mind are the changes which have taken place in the Congress and in the outdoor recreation constituencies.

In the first instance, we should note that the guard has changed, and that many of the prime shapers of Federal recreation legislation and systems are gone from the Washington scene. Their experience and influence cannot be quickly replaced, although some newer Members are supportive of recreational matters.

In the second instance, the number of groups which have made the case for recreation legislation before the Congress has increased. Some of these new groups, such as Friends of the Earth, have represented a strong protectionist philosophy. Now, however, additional organizations, such as the American Ski Federation, representing a different economic and development attitude toward recreation matters are coming onto the Washington scene.

The resulting interplay between the changing Congress and the changing voices for outdoor recreation interests should provide for interesting new trends in the near future.

LAND MANAGEMENT POLICY AND PROGRAM TRENDS<sup>1</sup>

Darrell E. Lewis<sup>2</sup>

---

There has been a shift in federal land management agencies toward less facility-oriented recreational activities. This shift is described by executive messages and legislation. Other indicators of the shift are President Carter's environmental message of 1979, establishment of additional National Recreation Trails, and a combined report to the President by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior which describes coordinated objectives and action plans developed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

---

In spite of the fact that land management policies and programs have recently focused on such topics as oil and gas, coal, timber, and range, there have been several key indicators of outdoor recreation trends.

President Carter's Environmental Message of August 2, 1979, contained specific directions regarding Wild and Scenic Rivers, Trails, and increased coordination between the two largest federal land managers, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. The Urban Recreation Study conducted by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service signals another change in emphasis. The popularity of the term "dispersed recreation" in several land management agencies signals a shift toward less facility-oriented recreational activities. Yet another indicator is the adoption of the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum by the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service as a means of dealing with recreation within the multiple-use management perspective. In this paper, some of these key signals are identified and briefly described.

PRESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL MESSAGE OF 1979

Wild and Scenic Rivers

"Development along the banks of our rivers continues to outpace our ability to protect those rivers that might qualify for designation. This problem is particularly acute near urban areas, where there are greater demands for

recreational opportunities which can partly be met by river protection.

We need to speed up the process for studying Wild and Scenic Rivers for designation and to consider the protection of rivers or parts of rivers which can protect important natural ecosystems. Moreover, the federal government should set an example of sound management for state, local, and private landowners by taking an aggressive role in protecting possible Wild and Scenic Rivers which flow through our public lands. Accordingly, I am directing the following actions be taken:

- federal land management agencies shall assess whether rivers located on their lands and identified in the National Inventory prepared by Heritage Conservation Service are suitable for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System; if so, these agencies shall take prompt action to protect the rivers--either by preparing recommendations for their designation or by taking immediate action to protect them;
- all federal agencies shall avoid or mitigate adverse effects on rivers identified in the National Inventory; and
- the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly revise their Guidelines for evaluating wild, scenic, and recreational rivers to ensure consideration of river ecosystems and to shorten the time currently used to study rivers for designation."

These measures are currently underway and represent a considerably stronger protective stance on the treatment of possible Wild and Scenic Rivers which flow through federally administered lands.

<sup>1</sup>Paper presented at the National Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium, Durham, NH, April 20-23, 1980.

<sup>2</sup>Chief, Division of Recreation and Cultural Resources, Bureau of Land Management, USDI, Washington, D.C. 20240.

### National Trails

"Under my direction, the U.S. Forest Service will establish 145 additional National Recreation Trails by January 1980, achieving a goal of two National Recreation Trails in each National Forest System unit. I am directing each federal land management agency to follow the example set by the Forest Service and by January 1980 announce a goal for the number of National Recreation Trails each agency will establish during 1980 on the public lands administered by the agency. I am also directing that, by the end of 1980, a minimum of 75 new National Recreation Trails shall be designated on public land other than National Forests by the federal land management agencies.

I am directing the Secretary of the Interior, through the Interagency Trails Council, to assist other federal agencies in surveying existing trails on federal lands to determine which of those can be made part of our National Trails System and to initiate a grass-roots effort in every region of the Country to assess our nationwide trails needs. In addition, I am directing the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority to encourage states, localities, Indian tribes, and private landholders to designate trails on their lands."

This effort has refocused land manager's attention to hiking trails across the Nation.

### Coordination between the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service

"I am directing the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to work together to coordinate their Departments' natural resource policies and programs, particularly those of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. I am requesting the two Secretaries to develop within six months a detailed statement of coordination objectives and a process and timetable for achieving them."

This assignment resulted in the submission of a report to the President by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior on February 6, 1980.

The report describes coordination objectives and action plans developed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. The report addresses the following areas:

1. Program Cycles
2. Program Development
3. Jurisdictional Transfers and Boundary Adjustments
4. Energy and Minerals

5. Common Procedures in Grazing Management
6. Sharing Facilities/Personnel/Training
7. Research
8. Public Involvement
9. Other

Of particular interest to this group is the fact that outdoor recreation policies and procedures have been identified for the formation of a topical subgroup to develop action programs.

### Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

This will prove to be quite timely as the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service have already begun to come closer together philosophically on the basics of outdoor recreation. Thanks to the research efforts of the Forest Service, the concept of an outdoor recreation spectrum has been endorsed by both agencies and is presently being incorporated into inventory planning, and management policies and procedures for both agencies.

### Recreation Land Acquisition

Another recent indicator of outdoor recreation policy has been the administration's proposal to reduce the federal portion of the Land and Water Conservation Fund from \$357 million available in FY 1980 to \$256 million to reduce federal spending. An additional cut from \$252 million to \$75 million is being proposed by the President for FY 1981.

THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
RECREATION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES<sup>1</sup>

Gerald T. Purvis<sup>2</sup>

---

This paper provides a brief legislative history of Corps responsibilities for public recreation, outlines its relationships with non-federal agencies and organizations and describes a number of environmental concerns it sees in its new outlook for management of recreation resources. A Recreation-Resource Management System is also described that contains data on the management of natural and developed resources, personnel and other relevant subjects at more than 400 Corps projects.

---

The purpose of this paper is to give a general overview of the Corps of Engineers and the Recreation-Resource Management Program at water resource development projects. A few selected current problems are outlined and presented in brief discussion.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was the first federal agency to protect public park lands when they were called on to protect the resources of Yellowstone National Park in 1886. This lasted for nearly 30 years until Congress created the National Park Service. However, it wasn't until enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1944 that the Corps actually became a major land management agency with all of the inherent visitor assistance responsibilities.

It is the policy of the Corps to provide safe and healthful recreation opportunities while protecting and enhancing the project resources. In the original acquisition of land at civil works installations, the Corps of Engineers obtains proprietary interests only. Individual states and their political subdivisions retain the statutory authority and inherent responsibility to enforce state and local laws. Park managers and rangers do not have the legal authority to enforce state and local laws. Our authority is limited to issuance of citations for violation of Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations. Park managers and rangers do not have the legal

authority to arrest, carry weapons, or other items such as mace, nightsticks, or other similar equipment normally associated with law enforcement. Park managers and rangers cannot search or seize under this authority. Personnel may stop, but not physically detain the public while implementing these regulations. The citation authority used to implement Title 36 was enacted by Congress in 1970.

In 1976, Congress, recognizing the limited authority of the Corps in law enforcement and also the burden that these projects had placed on local authorities, enacted Section 120 of the Water Resource Development Act of 1976. This authority provided that the Corps could enter into contracts with states or their political subdivisions to obtain increased law enforcement at Civil Works water resource development projects. It is not intended that this authority diminish or otherwise limit the existing law enforcement responsibilities of the state or local law enforcement agencies. Unfortunately, the Congressional authority was limited to fiscal years 1978 and 1979 on a trial basis. Although the Corps and local authorities have praised the program as being successful, Congress has not extended that authority. We hope they will do so very shortly. We have found that this program has created better cooperation and rapport between local law enforcement officers and Corps project personnel, reduced incidents of vandalism and other disturbances, increased public's sense of security and reduced the Corps personnel's exposure to high risk situations affecting their safety and that of the public. Currently, the Senate has proposed a bill which would extend this authority.

---

<sup>1</sup>Paper presented at the National Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium, Durham, NH, April 20-23, 1980.

<sup>2</sup>Chief, Recreation-Resource Management Branch, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C. 20314.

While the Corps does not take its visitor assistance responsibility lightly, we hire our personnel for a professional job of managing project resources, not to perform law enforcement duties. We will continue to train our personnel to assist the visitor in every way possible, but maintaining a low key law enforcement image.

In 1965, the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (P.L. 89-72) was enacted requiring that full consideration be given to the opportunities, if any, that water resource projects afford outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. This legislation also requires that, on projects authorized after 9 July 1965, 50 percent of the separable costs for development of recreation facilities be borne by a non-federal public agency and that the non-federal public agency bear the cost of operation and maintenance of the recreation.

Only two major land management agencies of the federal government are affected by P.L. 89-72; the Corps of Engineers and the Water and Power Resources Service. Other federal land management agencies continue to develop recreation facilities at 100 percent federal cost. Studies have shown that the major impact of the provisions of P.L. 89-72 is on the Corps projects. This is partly a result of the ability of the Water and Power Resources Service to transfer operation and maintenance responsibilities at their projects to the National Park Service and other Bureaus of the Department of the Interior.

Once a transfer has been made to another federal agency, the provisions of P.L. 89-72 are not applicable to that agency. A Corps project constructed outside the boundaries of a national forest, for example, is subject to the cost sharing provisions of P.L. 89-72. However, when a Corps project is constructed partially or wholly within the boundaries of a national forest, responsibilities for planning, development and management may be transferred to the U.S. Forest Service under the terms of the 1965 Memorandum of Agreement between the Secretaries of the Army and Agriculture. Those lands which are transferred to the Forest Service under such an agreement may be developed by the Forest Service without a cost sharing agreement with a non-federal agency. Those lands retained by the Corps require a cost sharing contract with a non-federal public agency prior to development of recreation facilities.

Adequate time has passed for the basic assumption of P.L. 89-72 to be tested. Although countless contacts have been made with non-federal agencies in attempts to solicit non-federal sponsorship of recreation developments at Corps projects, progress has been very limited. Since the passage of the Act, 14 years ago, only 21 contracts have been consummated on

20 Corps projects.

The National Society for Park Resources, formerly the National Conference on State Parks, and a branch of NRPA, has passed resolutions opposing P.L. 89-72 as now written. NSPR spoke for all the Directors of State Park Agencies in passing these resolutions. The main objections to the act are (1) the imposition of financial hardships on state and local agencies, and (2) the program does not function in concert with state and local objectives and priorities.

It is difficult for states to commit their legislatures to a contract which requires 50 percent of the development cost for recreation in addition to the assumption of operation and maintenance and replacement responsibilities for a 50-year period on land to which the state holds no title. Considerable objections from state and local agencies in this regard have been encountered throughout the process of trying to obtain contracts at Corps of Engineers projects. Many states have constitutional or statutory prohibitions which preclude them from entering into long-term contracts as required by Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970.

Over the years the Corps of Engineers has always been successful in receiving non-federal cooperation in development and management of recreation areas when the proposal is compatible with the overall plans and objectives of the non-federal agency and within the budgetary limitations of that agency.

Since the beginning of Fiscal Year 1974 when the cost sharing principles of P.L. 89-72 were applied to further recreation development at completed water resource projects, the Corps of Engineers has entered into 113 contracts and supplemental agreements with non-federal entities.

From time to time, Congressional attention has been devoted to the provisions of P.L. 89-72 and attempts have been made to define workable amendments to the legislation. The most recent such amendment is contained in Senate Bill, S-2054. Among other things, this amendment would provide for an expansion of the minimum basic recreation and fish and wildlife areas and facilities to be provided at full federal funding. It also provides for retention of lands acquired for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes for which they were acquired as long as the lands are capable of serving the purpose for which they were acquired. The bill would also provide that when an agreement cannot be executed with a non-federal public body, the agency could develop and manage the area subject to an approved master plan to meet recreation needs. The amendment further provides for the encouragement of the development of tourist facilities by the private sector.

While no 89-72 contracts have been cancelled, approximately 70 recreation areas have been returned to the Corps for operation and maintenance. In these cases the facilities were built at 100 percent federal cost and leased to the locals for operation and maintenance purposes. The state of Pennsylvania is currently considering turning six projects, now under lease, back to the Corps for O&M. Considering the limited resources available, it may become necessary to close these areas to public use until the local sponsors can meet the O&M responsibilities.

The Corps of Engineers has been committed for several years to contracting with the private sector for a great deal of its goods and services. We have been relying on private contractors to perform many routine services, i.e., daily park maintenance, scheduled grounds and facility maintenance, one-time maintenance jobs, park gate attendances, use fee collectors, and major repairs, etc.

In March, 1979, OMB issued a revised OMB Circular A-76 which (1) reaffirms the Government's general policy of reliance on the private sector for goods and services, while recognizing (2) that certain functions are inherently governmental in nature and must be performed by government personnel, and (3) relative cost must be given appropriate consideration in decisions between in-house performance and reliance on private commercial sources.

The guidelines included in A-76 will require the Corps to review its total program of activities and determination will have to be made on how those activities will be achieved, in-house or by contracting out. Frankly, the guidelines are geared to contracting out. However, there are circumstances which indicate performance by in-house capability. In the area of recreation resource management, we feel that we can continue to demonstrate that some of our tasks can be accomplished in-house at a cost that is less than contract performance. In other words, we will contract out if it is cost efficient. This does not mean that we will get any new personnel spaces if the activity based on A-76 guidelines can best be performed in-house. Additional personnel spaces may be requested from OMB if this is the case.

The A-76 guidelines will have no cause or effect on the Set-Aside Programs such as 8-a or minority contracts. It is the general policy of the Corps to ensure that small businesses, including those owned and managed by disadvantaged persons, receive a fair share of government contract awards.

A number of environmental concerns are a part of the new outlook for recreation resources management in the Corps.

1. The Aquatic Plant Control Program has expanded to meet problems which have become recognized throughout the Country. Research, planning, and control/operations have been increased to address biological, chemical, mechanical and integrated control techniques to major populations of obnoxious aquatic plants. Legislation has been introduced to increase the annual budgetary ceiling from \$5 million to \$15 million.

2. Wildlife management and enhancement of Corps projects have received considerable attention recently. Efforts are underway to assure that uniformly high quality wildlife management programs are applied consistently at Corps projects. Further efforts are underway to determine better techniques for satisfying our needs and responsibilities for mitigation of the loss of wildlife habitat and enhancement of habitat at existing projects. Many factors are, of course, involved in our reemphasis of wildlife management at our projects. The first is the character of wildlife resources of a plant community, as determined by the structural characteristics of those communities, and secondly, the characteristics of the wildlife fauna, as determined by the distribution and diversity of the various plant communities. These same characteristics, of course, also contribute to the value that an area has as a recreation site. Vegetation characteristics include type, shape, height, and mix of different species. These are used to determine the effects relationship between the proposed use and wildlife of the same area.

The species in each of these communities react differently to permanent recreation development. Some species benefit, while others would suffer. From this analysis, it may be determined that two mammals and three different bird species would be impacted by recreation development. For example, these may include deer and elk, and osprey, fan-tailed pigeon, and great blue heron.

In developing a process for other Resource Use Objectives programs for wildlife analysis, a series of basic steps should be considered: (1) obtain aerial photographs of project and the immediate area, (2) use the photo interpretation to map the vegetation zones, (3) select a stratified sample of each type of vegetation zone by conducting a ground survey to include the structure and composition of the vegetation and establish wildlife in vegetation zones, (4) coordinate with state and federal resource agencies to develop the species of specific concern, determine the problems associated with those species, and to determine areas of specific use for those species, and (5) formulate an effective relationship between vegetation and wildlife to develop a plan to optimize wildlife and recreation use. From this basic analysis, we

will come to a more realistic concern for the impacts of recreation on the environment.

3. Pollution abatement efforts at Corps projects continue. New facilities and rehabilitation of existing facilities to meet legislative requirements in recreation areas and at operational areas of Corps projects receive a relatively high priority within the overall mission of the Corps.

4. Lakeshore management efforts at existing projects have generally been successful in maintaining natural ecological values and providing for equitable public use at the 48,000 miles of shoreline located on Corps lakes.

5. For the past two years the Corps has participated with the National Wildlife Federation and others in the annual mid-winter Bald Eagle survey. We have found that the winter range for the Southern Bald Eagle has been enhanced by the creation of major dams on the waterways in the major flyways. These dams, in most cases, provide the only open water available in the area. Further, hydro-power projects provide food, in the form of chopped-up fish, during periods of generation.

6. The Recreation Research Program (RRP) is an on-going research and development program managed by the Waterways Experiment Station in Vicksburg, Mississippi. Each year problem statements are evaluated and prioritized; those receiving the highest priority ratings are generally funded first. On-going research projects include the development and management of a Recreation Research and Demonstration System and guidelines for the establishment of carrying capacities. Other research topics include visitor safety, operations and maintenance contracting, concessionaire opportunities, and criteria for the development of roads and sanitary facilities.

A final on-going research program being managed by the RRP involves determining what impacts the energy situation is having on visitation patterns at Corps recreation areas. A final report is now being prepared and should be available by the end of this summer. There were some declines in visitation during 1979 on some Corps projects. Overall, however, demands for Corps resources are steadily increasing. Visitation to Corps recreation areas rose by 3 percent between 1978 and 1979 despite record high gasoline prices and shortages in many areas. One obvious reason for this increase is that 80 percent of all Corps projects are located within 50 miles of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Of these, 71 percent have metropolitan populations of 100,000 or more. Around 25 percent are either partially or wholly contained within an SMSA. Even though current data await further analysis, it looks as though the gasoline situation, by

forcing people not to travel as far but stay longer, will place even greater demands on Corps recreation facilities than ever before.

The Recreation-Resource Management System (RRMS) is an automated data base which has been maintained by the Recreation-Resource Management Branch since 1972. The RRMS contains data on more than 400 Corps of Engineers projects with an annual visitation of more than 5,000 people. Each project in the RRMS has data on the management of natural and developed resources, personnel, and other relevant project data.

Because the RRMS was designed to be a management information system, it was substantially modified in FY 1979 to provide comparative analysis of year-to-year data since CY 1978. In addition, all Corps districts and divisions were provided with immediate access to the data base through the use of remote terminals and a user oriented programming language. The enhancements of the RRMS allowed district and division personnel to prepare unique, ad hoc reports to assist in making day-to-day management decisions.

The Office of the Chief of Engineers uses the RRMS as a management tool and has the responsibility to provide several federal agencies with annual reports specifically tailored for their management needs. The RRMS is also used to respond to inquiries from Congress; other federal, state, and local agencies; universities; and interested parties concerned with recreational aspects of Corps projects.

Additional information on the RRMS is available from the annual publication "Recreation Statistics" published by the Corps of Engineers.

In general, these are some of the major challenges facing the Corps in the 80's. We must find more efficient ways to manage our resources. We must not only provide for recreation opportunities, we must protect and enhance the project resources. With increasing legislative requirements we must also reemphasize our environmental and fish and wildlife responsibilities.